

**Remarks****I. Administrative Overview**

Claims 1-48 were previously presented. Claims 1, 14, 19, 25, 32, 34, 40, 44 and 46 have been amended; Claims 10, 15-18, 33, 35-39, 41-43 and 47-48 have been cancelled. Upon entry of the present amendments, Claims 1-9, 11-14, 19-32, 34, 40 and 44-46 are pending of which Claims 1, 19 and 25 are independent claims. No new matter has been introduced.

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of all rejections levied against the pending claims.

**II. Examiner Interview Summary**

Applicants wish to thank Examiner Lindsey for taking the time on March 17, 2009 to discuss the application with the Applicants' Representative and for providing the interview summary for the interview. During the discussion, Applicants' Representative presented a proposed set of claim amendments and Examiner Lindsey noted that the proposed claim amendments appear to overcome the current rejections, but that he would conduct a further review of the art.

**III. Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112**

Claims 1, 14, 19, 25, 34, 40, 44 and 46 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, for failing to comply with the written description requirement. Applicants respectfully submit that the amendments made to Claims 1, 14, 19, 25, 34, 40, 44 and 46 overcome this rejection. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw this rejection.

**IV. Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103****Claims 1, 10-13, 14, 19-20, 25, 33-34, 40 and 44-46**

Claims 1, 10-13, 14, 19-20, 25, 33-34, 40 and 44-46 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over U.S. Publication No. 2003/0087219 A1 to Berger et al. ("Berger") in view of Universal Serial Bus Specification Revision 2.0, April 2000 ("USB"). Claims 10 and 33 have been cancelled thereby mooted the rejection with respect to those claims. Applicants

respectfully submit that Claims 1, 11-13, 14, 19-20, 25, 34, 40 and 44-46 are patentable over any combination of Berger and USB.

*Prima facie* obviousness requires that cited references, alone or together, teach or suggest each and every element of the claimed invention. Applicants respectfully submit that neither Berger nor USB teaches or suggests binding an event notification to a port number associated with a virtual communication channel to generate binding information associated with a device, as is required by independent Claims 1, 19 and 25.

Berger describes a system for synching a personal digital assistant with a web-based data system via an agent on a client that receives data from a server. *See* Berger, paragraphs 35 and 82-84. At no point does Berger describe a virtual communication channel, much less binding an event notification to a port number associated with a virtual communication channel. Furthermore, the Examiner admits that Berger does not explicitly state that a device is bound to a port number within a virtual communication channel. *See* Office Action mailed March 5, 2009, page 4. Therefore, Berger fails to teach or suggest each and every element of the claimed invention.

USB describes how each USB device has a unique device identifier and one or more endpoints that can be further associated with a number. *See* USB p. 32. USB does not, however, teach or suggest binding a port number or endpoint number to an event notification, nor does USB teach or suggest creating binding information. Thus, USB fails to teach or suggest each and every element of the claimed invention.

Both Berger and USB fail to teach or suggest binding an event notification to a port number associated with a virtual communication channel to generate binding information associated with a device, therefore Claims 1, 19 and 25 are patentable over any combination of Berger and USB. Claims 11-13, 14, 20, 34, 40 and 44-46 depend on Claims 1, 19 and 25, therefore Claims 11-13, 14, 20, 34, 40 and 44-46 are also patentable over Berger in view of USB. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the rejection with respect to these claims.

Claims 2, 5, 15, 26, 35 and 43

Claims 2, 5, 15, 26, 35 and 43 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Berger in view of USB and in further view of U.S. Patent No. 7,024,501 B1 to Wright (“Wright”). Claims 15, 35 and 43 have been cancelled thereby mooted the rejection with respect to those claims. Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 2, 5 and 26 as previously presented are patentable over any combination of Berger, USB and Wright.

Establishing *prima facie* obviousness of a claimed invention requires that the prior art teach or suggest each claim limitation. In view of the arguments stated above, Applicants respectfully submit that independent Claims 1, 19 and 25 are patentable and in a condition for allowance. Therefore Claims 2, 5 and 26 are also patentable and in a condition for allowance because Claims 2, 5 and 26 depend on and incorporate all the patentable subject matter of Claims 1, 19 and 25. Furthermore, the Examiner cites Wright merely to address mapping a device communicating with the client system via a Wi-Fi connection. Like Berger and USB, Wright also fails to teach or suggest binding an event notification to a port number associated with a virtual communication channel to generate binding information associated with a device. Thus, Wright fails to detract from the patentability of the claimed invention. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the rejection with respect to these claims.

Claims 3-4, 16-17, 27-28, 36-37 and 41-42

Claims 3-4, 16-17, 27-28, 36-37 and 41-42 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Berger in view of USB and in further view of U.S. Patent No. 6,961,942 B1 to Adderman (“Adderman”). Claims 16-17, 36-37 and 41-42 have been cancelled thereby mooted the rejection with respect to those claims. Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 3-4 and 27-28 are patentable over any combination of Berger, USB and Adderman.

Establishing *prima facie* obviousness of a claimed invention requires that the prior art teach or suggest each claim limitation. In view of the arguments stated above, Applicants respectfully submit that independent Claims 1, 19 and 25 are patentable and in a condition for allowance. Therefore Claims 3-4 and 27-28 are also patentable and in a condition for allowance because Claims 3-4 and 27-28 depend on and incorporate all the patentable subject matter of Claims 1, 19 and 25. Furthermore, the Examiner cites Adderman merely to address mapping a device communicating with the client system via an IR serial protocol. Like Berger and USB, Adderman also fails to teach or suggest binding an event notification to a port number associated

with a virtual communication channel to generate binding information associated with a device. Thus, Adderman fails to detract from the patentability of the claimed invention. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the rejection with respect to these claims.

Claims 6, 9, 18, 21, 22, 29, 32 and 38-39

Claims 6, 9, 18, 21, 22, 29, 32 and 38-39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Berger in view of USB and in further view of U.S. Patent No. 7,325,026 B1 to North (“North”). Claims 18 and 38-39 have been cancelled thereby mooted the rejection with respect to those claims. Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 6, 9, 21, 22, 29 and 32 are patentable over any combination of Berger, USB and North.

Establishing *prima facie* obviousness of a claimed invention requires that the prior art teach or suggest each claim limitation. In view of the arguments stated above, Applicants respectfully submit that independent Claims 1, 19 and 25 are patentable and in a condition for allowance. Therefore Claims 6, 9, 21, 22, 29 and 32 are also patentable and in a condition for allowance because Claims 6, 9, 21, 22, 29 and 32 depend on and incorporate all the patentable subject matter of Claims 1, 19 and 25. Furthermore, the Examiner cites North merely to address using socket communication for inter-process communications, and hooking a socket call within the user session. Like Berger and USB, North also fails to teach or suggest binding an event notification to a port number associated with a virtual communication channel to generate binding information associated with a device. Thus, North fails to detract from the patentability of the claimed invention. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the rejection with respect to these claims.

Claims 7-8, 23-24 and 30-31

Claims 7-8, 23-24 and 30-31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Berger in view of USB in view of North and in further view of U.S. Patent No. 7,051,108 B1 to Jones (“Jones”). Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 7-8, 23-24 and 30-31 are patentable over any combination of Berger, USB, North and Jones.

Establishing *prima facie* obviousness of a claimed invention requires that the prior art teach or suggest each claim limitation. In view of the arguments stated above, Applicants

respectfully submit that independent Claims 1, 19 and 25 are patentable and in a condition for allowance. Therefore Claims 7-8, 23-24 and 30-31 are also patentable and in a condition for allowance because Claims 7-8, 23-24 and 30-31 depend on and incorporate all the patentable subject matter of Claims 1, 19 and 25. Furthermore, the Examiner cites Jones merely to address wherein the hooking is a virtual loop-back address hooking. Like Berger, USB and North, Jones also fails to teach or suggest binding an event notification to a port number associated with a virtual communication channel to generate binding information associated with a device. Thus, Jones fails to detract from the patentability of the claimed invention. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the rejection with respect to these claims.

#### Claim 48

Claim 48 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Berger in view of USB in view of North and in further view of U.S. Patent No. 6,970,924 B1 to Chu (“Chu”). Claim 48 has been cancelled thereby mooted this rejection. Accordingly Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the rejection with respect to this claim.

#### **V. Conclusion**

Applicants contend that each of the Examiner’s rejections has been adequately addressed and that all of the pending claims are in a condition for allowance. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of all grounds of rejection, and allowance of the pending claims.

Should the Examiner feel that a telephone conference with Applicants’ agent would expedite prosecution of this application; the Examiner is urged to contact the Applicants’ agent at the telephone number identified below.

Respectfully submitted,  
CHOATE, HALL & STEWART LLP

Date: June 4, 2009

/Kellan D. Ponikiewicz/  
Kellan D. Ponikiewicz  
Registration Number: 59,701

Patent Group  
CHOATE, HALL & STEWART LLP  
Two International Place  
Boston, MA 02110  
Phone: (617) 248-5000  
Fax: (617) 502-5002